

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 remain in the application.

A. Claim rejections.

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by or obvious over Pick. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 calls for, among other things, a conductive electrode affixed to the fibrous filter media, wherein the conductive electrode makes physical contact to the fibrous filter media in a plurality of substantially planar locations. The Office action does not even allege that Pick et al. shows or suggest a conductive electrode that makes physical contact to the filter media, nor does the Office action state where the Pick reference shows or suggests contact between the electrode and the filter media in a plurality of substantially planar locations. Because the Office action fails to state these elements of claim 1 as a part of the rejection, the Office action fails to state a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness. For this reason the rejection should be withdrawn.

Moreover, Pick does not show contact at a plurality of substantially planar locations. Even if the screens 14 (Figure 1), 24 (Figure 2 and Figure 3), 36 (Figure 5) and 46 (Figure 6) are considered to be electrodes, there is no indication that they are affixed to the filter media in any manner. Each of these embodiments merely places the screen adjacent to the filter media without any suggestion to affix the screen to the filter media. To the extent the arrangement in Pick results in contact between the screen and the filter media, the contact will be non-uniform, uncontrolled, and irregular. Shipping, installation and pressures that result during operation will negatively impact the degree and location of contact and therefore impact filter performance and lifetime. The improvements of the filter assembly of claim 1 address many of these deficiencies of the Pick design.

Further, the irregular contact provided by Pick does not show or suggest making contact at a plurality of substantially planar locations. As noted in the specification, it is important to maintain and substantially maximize the electrode

separation. When the electrode is allowed to contact the filter media in multiple planes, the enhancement provided by the electrode is compromised. Pick does not recognize the advantage of making contact in a plurality of substantially planar locations nor does Pick teach such an arrangement. In Figure 3 of Pick, for example, close examination of the drawing shows that the charging screen makes contact at various portions of the filter pleats, and does not make contact at all to other pleats.

For at least these reasons, Pick does not show or suggest independent claim 1. Claims 2-6 and 9-11 that depend from claim 1 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Further, the particular limitations of claims 3-5, 9 and 11 are not shown or fairly suggested by the Pick reference. Accordingly, claims 1-6 and 9-11 are allowable over the relied on reference.

Independent claim 12 calls for an activity of affixing a substantially planar conductive electrode to the fibrous filter media such that the conductive electrode physically contacts the fibrous filter media at a plurality of locations. Claim 12 is distinct from Pick for at least the same reasons as claim 1 set out above. Specifically, Pick does not show or suggest affixing the electrode to the media, nor does Pick show or suggest performing the activity of affixing so as to result in the particular contact locations called for in claim 12. Claims 15 and 16 that depend from claim 12 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

B. Claim rejections.

Claims 7, 8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 obvious over Pick in view of Joannou et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 7, 8 and 13 are distinct over Pick for the reasons set out above with respect to claims 1 and 12 from which they depend, respectively. Joannou et al. do not supply the deficiencies set out above. Specifically, Joannou et al. do not show or suggest affixing the electrode to the media, nor do Joannou et al. show or suggest performing the activity of affixing so as to result in the particular contact locations called for in claim 12.

Notably, it does not appear that the glue beads 13 are employed by Joannou et al. in a manner that would allow them to affix a conductive screen to the filter pleats. In Fig. 6, for example, the glue bead appears to be on the side of the filter opposite the conductive electrode 7 which would prevent using the glue to affix the electrode. For at least these reasons claims 7, 8 and 13 are not made obvious by Pick in view of Joannou et al.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 obvious over Pick in view of Joannou et al. and further in view of Stemmer. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As Stemmer does not show or suggest the deficiencies of the Pick and Joannou et al. references noted above, claim 14 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 obvious over Pick in view of Coppom. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claim 17 calls for a conductive electrode making physical contact to the fibrous filter media in a plurality of substantially planar locations. As noted above, Pick does not show or suggest affixing the electrode to the media to provide a substantially planar contact called for in claim 17. Coppom, which is the same inventor as the instant application, does not supply the deficiencies of Pick.

Claims 18-22 that depend from claim 17 are allowable over Pick in view of Coppom for at least the same reasons as claim 17 as well as the additional limitations expressed in claims 18-22.

With respect to independent claim 23, the Office action fails to state any portions of the relied on combination of references that show or suggest establishing a substantially uniform electric field, hence fails to state a prima facie case of obviousness. Further, the combined references do not perform the activity of conducting collected charge to a power supply or ground. The irregular connection between a conductor and the media in Pick does not effectively conduct collected charge as called for in claim 23. For at least these reasons claim 23 is believed to be allowable over the relied on references.

Claim 24 calls for, among other things, a conductive electrode affixed to the fibrous filter media, wherein the conductive electrode makes physical contact

to the fibrous filter media in a plurality of substantially planar locations. As noted above, these features of claim 24 is not shown or suggested by the relied on references. Chapman does not supply this deficiency of Pick. Accordingly, claim 24 is believed to be allowable over the relied on references.


C. Conclusion.

The references that were cited but not relied upon are no more relevant than the references that were relied upon. In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

This response is filed together with a request for extension of time and the required fee. Any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

January 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Stuart T. Langley, Reg. No. 33,940
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(720) 406-5335 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax